

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 4-6 contain allowable subject matter and suggesting that they be rewritten in independent form. Applicants have chosen to maintain claims 4-6 in their dependant form due to the allowability of their respective base claims as detailed below.

Claims 1-3 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Motegi (Japanese Patent Application No. H10-105353). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite “a comparator that compares all of the images sizes in the print job with the paper sizes available in each printer to determine which single printer is most compatible with the entire print job; a selector that selects a printer to which the print job is sent based on the comparison results obtained by the comparator.” Motegi does not disclose or suggest such a feature. In contrast to claim 1, and as detailed in paragraph [0005] of applicants’ specification, Motegi teaches a system in which a single print job having a plurality of images in a plurality of sizes is sent to several different printers such that all of the images can be printed.

The Examiner has conceded that Motegi does not expressly disclose that a comparison is made, but asserts that some form of comparison is inherent in the printer selection of Motegi. Even if applicants accept that a comparison is inherent in the system of Motegi, applicants respectfully submit that “a comparator that compares all of the images sizes in the print job with the paper sizes available in each printer to determine which single printer is most compatible with the entire print job” is not. Because Motegi is designed to split a print job among several printers, it would go against the teachings and operation of Motegi to compare all of the images sizes in the print job with the paper sizes available in each individual printer. Motegi has no reason to determine which printer is most capable of handling an entire print job, as it is concerned with which printer is most capable to handle each image size present in a print job. Motegi would therefore compare each image size with each available paper size.

Furthermore, Motegi does not disclose or suggest determining which single printer is most compatible with the entire print job; this determination would be of no use to the system of Motegi which uses multiple printes and is only concerned whith which printer can print each individual image size.

Accordingly, Motegi does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1, which is therefore allowable. Claims 8 and 10 recite features substantially similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Claims 8 and 10 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons detailed above. Claims 2-7, 9 and 11 depend from allowable claims and are therefore allowable due at least to their respective dependencies.


Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Motegi in view of Shima (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,909). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Shima, which discloses a system and method for using multiple printers, does not disclose the features of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Shima does not overcome the deficiencies of Motegi with regard to claim 1. Claim 7 is also allowable due to its dependency on allowable claim 1.

Applicants solicit an early action allowing the claims.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief, including extensions of time, and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. **325772026900**.

Dated: May 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Adam Keser

Registration No. 54,217
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7301